arXiv:1601.03715v1 [quant-ph] 14 Jan 2016

Distribution of the Time at Which an Ideal Detector Clicks

Roderich Tumulka*

January 8, 2016

Abstract

We consider the problem of computing, for a detector waiting for a quantum particle to arrive, the probability distribution of the time at which the detector clicks, from the initial wave function of the particle in the non-relativistic regime. Although the standard rules of quantum mechanics offer no operator for the time of arrival, quantum mechanics makes an unambiguous prediction for this distribution, defined by first solving the Schrödinger equation for the big quantum system formed by the particle of interest, the detector, a clock, and a device that records the time when the detector clicks, then making a quantum measurement of the record at a very late time, and finally using the distribution of the recorded time. This leads to question whether there is also a practical, simple rule for computing this distribution, at least approximately (i.e., for an idealized detector). We argue here in favor of a rule based on a 1-particle Schrödinger equation with a certain (absorbing) boundary condition at the ideal detecting surface, first considered by Werner in 1987. We present a novel derivation of this rule and describe how it arises as a limit of a "soft" detector represented by an imaginary potential.

Key words: detection time in quantum mechanics, time observable, time of arrival in quantum mechanics, absorbing boundary condition in quantum mechanics, POVM, quantum Zeno effect, imaginary potential.

Introduction.—Consider a region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ in physical space with detectors placed everywhere along the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and a non-relativistic quantum particle starting at time $t = 0$ with wave function ψ_0 whose support lies inside Ω. Sooner or later, one of the detectors may register the particle, thus defining exit time T and exit position $\boldsymbol{X}$ in $\partial\Omega$, which we combine into the pair $Z = (T, \boldsymbol{X})$; in case no detector ever clicks we write $Z = \infty$. Our goal is to predict, from ψ_0, the probability distribution of the random variable Z in $\mathscr{Z} = [0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega \cup \{\infty\}$.

*Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, Hill Center, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA. E-mail: tumulka@math.rutgers.edu

Although there is no self-adjoint time operator, the distribution of T and $\boldsymbol{X}$ can in principle be computed from quantum mechanics by treating the detectors themselves as quantum mechanical systems, coupled to the particle under study, and by further including a clock and a device that records the time of the click and the location of the detector that clicked. Suppose that the full system $\mathscr{S}$ remains isolated until a late time t_f; then the Schrödinger equation determines $\mathscr{S}$'s wave function Ψ_{t_f}, and the distribution $|\Psi_{t_f}|^2$ determines in particular the probability that the record was $(t, \boldsymbol{x})$. While this procedure provides no practical method of computing the distribution of $Z = (T, \boldsymbol{X})$, it implies that the distribution of Z, as a function of ψ_0, is of the form

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{\psi_0}\big(Z \in B\big) = \langle \psi_0 | E(B) | \psi_0 \rangle \tag{1}$$

for some positive-operator-valued measure (POVM) E on $\mathscr{Z}$ (see [8] or [3, p. 6], and [21] about POVMs in general). The back effect of the presence of detectors on the wave function is already included in (1), and the POVM E will in principle depend on the initial wave function of the detectors.

A practical method of computing E would exist, however, if there is a POVM E_0, or a family E_κ depending on one or few parameters κ, representing an "ideal detecting surface" at $\partial\Omega$, such that for every setup of real detectors along $\partial\Omega$ the true POVM E is reasonably close to one of the E_κ. The idealized POVM E_κ would disregard physical details that may vary from one detector to another, and it would at the same time represent the "best possible" detector, which real detectors should be designed to approximate. In fact, it appears to be common experience that detection probabilities do not depend in an essential way on the physical nature of the detectors, except that different types of detectors are sensitive to different species of particles and at different energies. Moreover, the fact that the position operators of quantum mechanics define the probability distribution of the particle if we choose to detect it at time t_0, viz., $|\psi_{t_0}(\boldsymbol{x})|^2$, independently of the details of the detector, seems to support the possibility of a mathematical concept of an ideal detector.

In this paper, we argue in favor of a particular proposal of such a POVM E_κ, i.e., a practical rule for computing the distribution of Z (and thus also a definition of an "ideal detector") that we call the *absorbing boundary rule*. The equations of this rule were considered before by Werner [25] but did not receive much attention in the literature, e.g., [11, 1, 17, 18, 19, 24, 5]. It would be interesting to study a detailed model of a detector, but we do not do this here; rather, we explain why the absorbing boundary rule achieves exactly what one should look for in a candidate of a notion of ideal detector. The POVM E_κ depends on, apart from the surface $\partial\Omega$ and the particle's mass m, a parameter $\kappa > 0$ that we call the *wave number of sensitivity* of the detector. Two basic properties of the absorbing boundary rule are that (i) it describes a "hard" detector, i.e., one that is 100% efficient so that a particle cannot pass it without triggering it, and (ii) a wave packet moving towards the detecting surface will not be completely absorbed but partly reflected. We also explain below why one should expect property (ii). In view of the quantum Zeno effect [15, 5], it may seem surprising that a rule can have

property (i). Furthermore, we present a novel derivation of the absorbing boundary rule and propose a rule for the mathematical representation of an ideal "soft" detector, i.e., one that takes a while to notice the particle, in terms of an imaginary potential. It turns out that the absorbing boundary arises as a limiting case of vanishing softness. Finally, we contrast the absorbing boundary rule with the situation in the scattering regime, in which the detectors are infinitely far and infinitely soft. Elsewhere, we describe its natural extension to the case of moving detectors [22], that of several particles [22], that of particles with spin [22, 23], and that of a discrete lattice [6]; we develop an analog for the Dirac equation in [23]. In [6] we also show that the absorbing boundary rule can be obtained in a limit similar but not identical to that considered in the quantum Zeno effect [15, 5], involving repeated quantum measurements of the projection to Ω at time intervals of length τ, on a particle moving on a lattice of width ε, and letting $\tau \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$ (and possibly m vary) while $\hbar\tau/4m\varepsilon^3 \to \kappa$. In [7], we derive an uncertainty relation between the detection time T and the energy of the initial wave function ψ_0.

Statement of the Absorbing Boundary Rule.—Let $\kappa > 0$ be a constant of dimension 1/length. Solve the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\psi + V\psi \tag{2}$$

in Ω with potential $V : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = i\kappa\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{3}$$

at every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega$, with $\partial/\partial n$ the outward normal derivative on the surface (as one would use in a Neumann boundary condition), i.e., $\partial\psi/\partial n := \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \nabla\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ with $\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})$ the outward unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ at $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega$. (As described in [20], it follows from the Hille–Yosida theorem that a solution to (2) and (3) exists and is unique for $\psi_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, a result also obtained in [25].) Assume that $\|\psi_0\|^2 = \int_\Omega d^3\boldsymbol{x}\,|\psi_0(\boldsymbol{x})|^2 = 1$. Then, the rule asserts,

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{\psi_0}\Big(t_1 \le T < t_2, \boldsymbol{X} \in B\Big) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_B d^2\boldsymbol{x}\; \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{4}$$

for any $0 \le t_1 < t_2$ and any set $B \subseteq \partial\Omega$, with $d^2\boldsymbol{x}$ the surface area element and $\boldsymbol{j}^\psi$ the probability current vector field defined by ψ, which is

$$\boldsymbol{j}^\psi = \frac{\hbar}{m}\mathrm{Im}\,\psi^*\nabla\psi\,. \tag{5}$$

In other words, the joint probability density of T and $\boldsymbol{X}$ relative to $dt\,d^2\boldsymbol{x}$ is the normal component of the current across the boundary, $j_n^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Furthermore,

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{\psi_0}(Z = \infty) = 1 - \int_0^\infty dt \int_\Omega d^2\boldsymbol{x}\; \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x})\,. \tag{6}$$

This completes the statement of the rule.

Properties of the Absorbing Boundary Rule.—To verify that this rule indeed defines a probability distribution, we note that $\boldsymbol{j}^\psi$ is always outward-pointing at the boundary as a consequence of the boundary condition (3):

$$j_n^\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\hbar}{m}\mathrm{Im}\Big[\psi^*(\boldsymbol{x})\,\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial n}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big] = \frac{\hbar\kappa}{m}|\psi(\boldsymbol{x})|^2 \geq 0\,. \tag{7}$$

This density, when integrated over $[0,\infty)\times\partial\Omega$, cannot be greater than 1 because $\|\psi_0\|^2 = 1$ and

$$\int_0^\infty dt \int_{\partial\Omega} d^2\boldsymbol{x}\, j_n^\psi(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \int_\Omega d^3\boldsymbol{x}\,|\psi_0(\boldsymbol{x})|^2 - \lim_{t\to\infty}\int_\Omega d^3\boldsymbol{x}\,|\psi_t(\boldsymbol{x})|^2\,, \tag{8}$$

an equation that follows from the continuity equation implied by the Schrödinger equation, $\partial|\psi|^2/\partial t = -\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{j}^\psi$, by integrating over Ω, applying the divergence theorem, and integrating over t. In particular, the right-hand side of (6) is non-negative and, in fact, equal to $\lim_{t\to\infty}\|\psi_t\|^2$. It follows also that $\|\psi_t\|^2 = \int_\Omega d^3\boldsymbol{x}\,|\psi_t(\boldsymbol{x})|^2$ is not conserved but instead is a decreasing function of t, so the time evolution of ψ_t in $\mathscr{H} = L^2(\Omega)$ is not unitary (see also [20, 6]). In fact, $\|\psi_t\|^2$, rather than being 1, is the probability that $T > t$ or $Z = \infty$, i.e., that no detection has occurred up to time t.

The rule corresponds to a POVM E_κ that can be expressed as

$$E_\kappa\big(dt\times d^2\boldsymbol{x}\big) = \frac{\hbar\kappa}{m}\,W_t^\dagger\,|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\langle\boldsymbol{x}|\,W_t\,dt\,d^2\boldsymbol{x} \tag{9}$$

$$E_\kappa(\{\infty\}) = I - E_\kappa([0,\infty)\times\partial\Omega) = \lim_{t\to\infty} W_t^\dagger W_t \tag{10}$$

with † denoting the adjoint operator and W_t the (non-unitary) linear operator that maps ψ_0 to ψ_t solving (2) and (3). The operators W_t for $t \geq 0$ have the properties $W_0 = I$, $W_tW_s = W_{t+s}$, and $\|W_t\psi\| \leq \|\psi\|$; that is, they form a *contraction semigroup*. Since the $E_\kappa(dt)$ are not projections, there are no eigenstates of detection time.

These considerations can be visualized in terms of Bohmian trajectories $\boldsymbol{X}(t)$ [10]: Bohm's equation of motion,

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{X}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{X}(t))}{|\psi_t(\boldsymbol{X}(t))|^2}\,, \tag{11}$$

implies together with (3) that trajectories can cross the boundary $\partial\Omega$ only outwards, in fact with the prescribed normal velocity $\hbar\kappa/m$. A detector clicks when and where the Bohmian particle reaches $\partial\Omega$; the probability distribution of this space-time point agrees with (4) since the initial distribution of the Bohmian particle is $|\psi_0|^2$ [4]. So for the Bohmian particle, $\partial\Omega$ is an *absorbing surface* or a *one-way surface*. If we had solved the Schrödinger equation on $\mathbb{R}^3$ instead of Ω, and without the boundary condition (3), as would be appropriate in the absence of detectors, then the Bohmian trajectory might cross $\partial\Omega$ several times, re-entering Ω after having left it [12, 24]. The boundary condition (3) excludes this. This example also illustrates why "time of detection" is a more accurate name for T than "time of arrival."

Although all Bohmian trajectories that reach $\partial\Omega$ have to cross it, part of the wave function reaching $\partial\Omega$ can be reflected. Of course, it should be expected that the presence of detectors along $\partial\Omega$ influences the evolution of ψ inside Ω. To quantify the reflection, consider the 1-dimensional version of the absorbing boundary rule for $\Omega = (-\infty, 0]$ with boundary $\partial\Omega = \{0\}$ and boundary condition $\psi'(0) = i\kappa\psi(0)$. The reflection coefficient R_k at wave number k is given by $R_k = |c_k|^2$, where c_k is the complex coefficient ensuring that the eigenfunction $\psi(x) = \exp(ikx) + c_k \exp(-ikx)$ satisfies the boundary condition; one finds that [6]

$$R_k = (k-\kappa)^2/(k+\kappa)^2\,. \tag{12}$$

The absorption coefficient is $A_k = 1 - R_k$, whose graph is depicted in Figure 1. At $k = \kappa$, the wave is completely absorbed, while waves of other wave numbers are partly absorbed and partly reflected. This means that our ideal detector surface absorbs (and detects) well in a certain energy range but poorly at much higher or lower energies, and κ is the wave number at which the detector is most sensitive.



Figure 1: Graph of the absorption strength A_k of the ideal detecting surface as a function of wave number k in units of κ. The maximum attained at $k = \kappa$ is equal to 1, corresponding to complete absorption.

Derivation of the Absorbing Boundary Rule.—Consider the description in which the detectors are treated as a quantum system D with configuration space $\mathcal{Q}_D = \mathbb{R}^{3N}$; call the particle P, with configuration space $\mathcal{Q}_P = \mathbb{R}^3$; the whole system $S = P \cup D$,

with configuration space $\mathcal{Q}_S = \mathcal{Q}_P \times \mathcal{Q}_D$, evoles unitarily with initial wave function $\Psi_0 = \psi_0 \otimes \phi_0$. Let Ξ_D denote the set of D-configurations in which the detectors have not clicked but are ready, and Υ_D the set of those in which a detector has fired, so the initial wave function of D, ϕ_0, is concentrated in Ξ_D, and Ψ_0 is concentrated in $\Omega \times \Xi_D \subset \mathcal{Q}_S$. In the interior of $\Omega \times \Xi_D$, there is no interaction between P and D, so Ψ_t should there, locally, remain a product $\psi_t \otimes \phi_t$ with ψ_t obeying the Schrödinger equation (2). The interaction starts taking place at the boundary $\partial\Omega \times \Xi_D$: Any probability current in $\mathcal{Q}_S$ that reaches $\partial\Omega \times \Xi_D$ should be transported quickly (ideally, immediately) to $\partial\Omega \times \Upsilon_D \subset \Upsilon_S := \mathcal{Q}_P \times \Upsilon_D$, a region of S-configuration space that is far from $\partial\Omega \times \Xi_D$, as configurations in Υ_S are macroscopically different from those in $\Xi_S = \mathcal{Q}_P \times \Xi_D$. Due to this separation, parts of Ψ that have reached Υ_S should not be able to propagate back to Ξ_S and interfere there with parts of Ψ that have not yet left Ξ_S; that is, the detection is practically irreversible. This is a form of *decoherence* between the part of the wave function that has passed $\partial\Omega$ and the part that has not: in the full configuration space $\mathcal{Q}_S$ the two parts do not overlap but are macroscopically separated. Also, the probability current should always flow from the interior of $\Omega \times \Xi_D$ to $(\mathcal{Q}_P \setminus \Omega) \times \Upsilon_D$. As a consequence, the P-component of the current at $\partial\Omega \times \Xi_D$ should be pointing outward. We are thus led to the following picture: (i) The Schrödinger equation (2) holds for ψ inside Ω. (ii) Something happens on $\partial\Omega$, which should not depend sensitively on the details of the initial detector state ϕ_0. (iii) The evolution of ψ_t in Ω is still linear, but no longer unitary because $\psi_t \otimes \phi_t$ is only a part of the full wave function Ψ_t, i.e., the part in Ξ_S. (iv) The current $\boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x})$ at $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega$ always points outward, $\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{j}^{\psi_t}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$. (v) The evolution of Ψ_t in Ξ_S is autonomous, i.e., not affected by whatever Ψ_t looks like in Υ_S, as those parts cannot propagate back to Ξ_S. (vi) Thus, the evolution of ψ_t in Ω should be autonomous, depending only on few parameters ("κ") encoding properties of the detectors.

These desiderata suggest considering a boundary condition at $\partial\Omega$ for ψ_t. By (iii), the boundary condition should be linear, and since the Schrödinger equation involves second-order space derivatives, it should involve up to first-order derivatives. The boundary condition should be local, i.e., involve only one $\boldsymbol{x}$, as there is nothing in the setup that would connect several boundary points. The most general boundary condition of this kind is

$$\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{\beta}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \nabla\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0 \tag{13}$$

for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega$ with coefficients $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{C}, \boldsymbol{\beta}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. This kind of mixed boundary condition (involving both ψ and its derivative) is known as a *Robin boundary condition*. It entails the following condition on the current $\boldsymbol{j}$ (multiply by $(\hbar/m)\psi^*(\boldsymbol{x})$ and take the imaginary part):

$$(\mathrm{Re}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{j} = -\tfrac{\hbar}{m}(\mathrm{Im}\,\alpha)|\psi|^2 + \tfrac{\hbar}{m}(\mathrm{Im}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathrm{Re}(\psi^* \nabla\psi)\,. \tag{14}$$

This condition will enforce that the current points outward, $j_n \geq 0$, if and only if $\mathrm{Re}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \gamma(\boldsymbol{x})\,\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})$ with $0 \neq \gamma(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{Im}\,\boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$, and $\gamma^{-1}\mathrm{Im}\,\alpha \leq 0$. In case $\mathrm{Im}\,\alpha = 0$,

it forces the normal current to vanish, so the relevant conditions (for which sometimes $j_n > 0$) are those with $\gamma^{-1}\mathrm{Im}\,\alpha < 0$.

We are thus led to a generalized version of (3) in which $i\kappa$ is replaced by $\nu + i\kappa$ with $\kappa > 0$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. In this generalized version it is still the case that (4) defines a probability distribution on $\mathscr{Z}$, but the maximal absorption (which still occurs at $k = \kappa$) is strictly less than 1 if $\nu \neq 0$, which suggests that the detector represented by this boundary condition is in a sense less than perfect. Also, a non-zero ν leads to a complex coefficient c_k for the reflected wave in $\psi(x) = \exp(ikx) + c_k \exp(-ikx)$, so that the reflected wave undergoes a phase shift, which may occur for a real detector but complicates matters unnecessarily if we want to consider an *ideal* detector. In short, for approximating a real detector a non-zero ν may be necessary, while the idealization $\nu = 0$ provides the simplest possible rule. We have already mentioned that desideratum (vi) is satisfied: the time evolution of ψ_t is autonomous (this is still true when $\nu \neq 0$).

In the Bohmian picture it becomes particularly transparent why one should demand that the current points outward on $\partial\Omega$ but not that the reflection coefficient vanishes. That is because the Bohmian picture provides a clear distinction between the absorption of the *particle* at $\partial\Omega$ and the absorption of the *wave*. When the particle reaches $\partial\Omega$ then detection should be inevitable and irreversible. There is no reason, however, to expect that the wave arriving at $\partial\Omega$ should be absorbed completely. On the contrary, one should expect partial reflection, so that the presence of the detector influences the evolution inside Ω.

Soft Detectors.—The absorbing boundary rule describes "hard" detectors, i.e., ones that detect a particle *immediately* when it arrives at the surface $\partial\Omega$. Real detectors, in contrast, may be "soft," i.e., take a while to notice the presence of a particle in the detector volume. We propose the following mathematical rule for an ideal soft detector. Let the detector volume be a shell of thickness $L > 0$ around Ω, let Ω_L denote the neighborhood of radius L around Ω (i.e., the union of Ω and the detector volume), and $\partial\Omega_L$ the outermost surface (at the back of the detector). At every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega_L$, we impose a Neumann boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0\,, \tag{15}$$

and at every $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the detector volume $\Omega_L \setminus \Omega$, we add a constant negative-imaginary potential to the Hamiltonian, so that the Schrödinger equation becomes, in $\Omega_L \setminus \Omega$,

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\psi + V\psi - iv\psi\,, \tag{16}$$

where $v > 0$ is a constant, the detection rate. Complex potentials have been used by various authors to model the absorption or removal of a quantum particle [16, 14, 2, 13]. The Schrödinger equation (2) remains unchanged inside Ω. The probability distribution of the detection time and place, $Z = (T, \boldsymbol{X}) \in [0,\infty) \times (\Omega_L \setminus \Omega)$ or $Z = \infty$, is given by

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{\psi_0}\Big(t_1 \leq T < t_2, \boldsymbol{X} \in B\Big) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_B d^3\boldsymbol{x}\; v|\psi_t(\boldsymbol{x})|^2 \tag{17}$$

for any $B \subseteq (\Omega_L \setminus \Omega)$, and

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{\psi_0}\big(Z=\infty\big) = 1 - \int_0^\infty dt \int_{\Omega_L\setminus\Omega} d^3\boldsymbol{x}\; v|\psi_t(\boldsymbol{x})|^2\,. \tag{18}$$

Again, $\|\psi_t\|^2$ is the probability that $T > t$ or $Z = \infty$. The Bohmian particle, whenever it is located in $\Omega_L \setminus \Omega$, gets absorbed at rate v.

We show in [6] for the 1-dimensional case (and make it plausible in any dimension) that in the limit $v \to \infty$, $L \to 0$, $0 < \lim(vL) < \infty$, the time evolution of ψ and the distribution of Z approach those of the absorbing boundary rule with $\kappa = (2m/\hbar^2)\lim(vL)$. This is still true if the Neumann condition (15) is replaced by a Robin boundary condition $\partial\psi/\partial n = c\,\psi$ with arbitrary real constant c, but not if replaced by a Dirichlet condition, $\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega$ [6].

While previous authors such as Allcock [2] have also considered representing a soft detector by an imaginary potential, they have not managed to identify a limit in which a non-trivial theory of a hard detector arises. In fact, Allcock considered the limit $v \to \infty$, $L = \infty$ (without any boundary condition such as (15)) and obtained correctly that the limit is equivalent to the Schrödinger equation with a Dirichlet boundary condition at $\partial\Omega$, which has zero current into the boundary and thus zero probability that the detector would ever be triggered. (Allcock concluded incorrectly that a concept of an ideal hard detector is impossible.)

Scattering.—In scattering theory, one considers n particles (suppose for simplicity $n = 1$) moving freely after interacting with (each other or) external obstacles. The scattering cross-section represents the probability distribution of where the particle gets detected on a surface $\partial\Omega$ that is a sphere of radius r in the limit $r \to \infty$. One assumes that no part of the arriving wave gets reflected, $R_k = 0$ for all k. As we show in [6], for the ideal soft detectors described above, $R_k \to 0$ for all k in the limit in which $v \to 0$ and $vL \to \infty$—a limit of infinite softness that seems entirely admissible in the scattering regime because if we allow very large distances $r \to \infty$ from the scattering center and very large times t then we may as well allow large distances and times within the detector volume before the particle gets detected.

Acknowledgments. I thank Abhishek Dhar, Shelly Goldstein, and Stefan Teufel for helpful discussions.

References

[1] Y. Aharonov, J. Oppenheim, S. Popescu, B. Reznik, and W.G. Unruh: Measurement of time of arrival in quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A* **57**: 4130 (1998) `http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9709031`

[2] G.R. Allcock: The time of arrival in quantum mechanics II. The individual measurement. *Annals of Physics* **53**: 286–310 (1969)

[3] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P.J. Lahti: *Operational Quantum Physics*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag (1995)

[4] M. Daumer, D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghì: On the quantum probability flux through surfaces. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **88**: 967–977 (1997). Reprinted in [9]. http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9512016

[5] S. Dhar, S. Dasgupta, and A. Dhar: Quantum time of arrival distribution in a simple lattice model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **48**: 115304 (2015) http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5923

[6] A. Dhar, S. Teufel, and R. Tumulka: Detection Time Distribution in Quantum Mechanics on a Lattice. In preparation (2016)

[7] A. Dhar, S. Teufel, and R. Tumulka: Energy–Time Uncertainty Relation for Absorbing Boundaries. In preparation (2016)

[8] D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghì: Quantum equilibrium and the role of operators as observables in quantum theory. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **116**: 959–1055 (2004). Reprinted in [9]. http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0308038

[9] D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, N. Zanghì: *Quantum Physics Without Quantum Philosophy.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag (2013)

[10] D. Dürr and S. Teufel: *Bohmian mechanics.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag (2009)

[11] N. Grot, C. Rovelli, and R.S. Tate: Time-of-arrival in quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A* **54**: 4676 (1996) http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9603021

[12] G. Grübl and K. Rheinberger: Time of Arrival from Bohmian Flow. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**: 2907–2924 (2002) http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0202084

[13] P.E. Hodgson: *Nuclear Reactions and Nuclear Structure*. Oxford: Clarendon (1971)

[14] R.D. Levine: *Quantum Mechanics of Molecular Rate Processes.* Oxford University Press (1969)

[15] B. Misra and E.C.G. Sudarshan: The Zeno's paradox in quantum theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **18**: 756–763 (1977)

[16] N.F. Mott and H.S. Massey: *The Theory of Atomic Collisions*, 3rd edition. Oxford University Press (1965)

[17] J.G. Muga and R. Leavens: Arrival Time in Quantum Mechanics. *Physics Reports* **338**: 353 (2000)

[18] J.G. Muga, R. Sala Mayato, Í.L. Egusquiza (editors): *Time in Quantum Mechanics, Vol. 1, Second Edition.* Lecture Notes in Physics **734**. New York: Springer (2008)

[19] J.G. Muga, A. Ruschhaupt, A. del Campo (editors): *Time in Quantum Mechanics, Vol. 2.* Lecture Notes in Physics **789**. New York: Springer (2009)

[20] S. Teufel and R. Tumulka: Existence of Schrödinger Evolution with Absorbing Boundary Conditions. In preparation (2016)

[21] R. Tumulka: POVM. Pages 479–483 in D. Greenberger, K. Hentschel, and F. Weinert (editors): *Compendium of Quantum Physics,* Berlin: Springer-Verlag (2009)

[22] R. Tumulka: Detection Time Distribution for Several Quantum Particles. Preprint (2016)

[23] R. Tumulka: Detection Time Distribution for the Dirac Equation. Preprint (2016)

[24] N. Vona, G. Hinrichs, and D. Dürr: What does one measure when one measures the arrival time of a quantum particle? *Physical Review Letters* **111**: 220404 (2013) `http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.4366`

[25] R. Werner: Arrival time observables in quantum mechanics. *Annales de l'Institute Henri Poincaré, section A* **47**: 429–449 (1987)